| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary 09/806,639 | |
|---|-----|
| Examiner Art Unit Lakshmi S. Channavajjala 1615 All Participants: Status of Application: non-final (1) Lakshmi S. Channavajjala. (3) (2) William valence. (4) Date of Interview: 7 April 2005 Time: Type of Interview: | |
| All Participants: (1) Lakshmi S. Channavajjala. (2) William valence. (4) Date of Interview: 7 April 2005 Type of Interview: Telephonic Video Conference | |
| (1) <u>Lakshmi S. Channavajjala</u> . (2) <u>William valence</u> . (4) Date of Interview: <u>7 April 2005</u> Time: Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference | |
| (2) William valence. (4) Date of Interview: 7 April 2005 Time: Type of Interview: Telephonic Video Conference | ` |
| Date of Interview: 7 April 2005 Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference | , |
| Type of Interview: ☑ Telephonic □ Video Conference | |
| ☐ Video Conference | |
| Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description: | |
| Part I. | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: of record | |
| Claims discussed: of record | |
| Prior art documents discussed: | |
| Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet | |
| Part III. | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substant of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | ice |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) | |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed the instant rejections and in view of the declaration and the applicants' arguments reagrding the prior art teachings, examiner suggested to the counsel that instant claims would be allowable upon limiting the claims to hydropxypropylmethylcellulose as the polymer. Counsel agreed and authorized examiner to amend the claims by examiner's amendment.